

FILED IN THE
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Jun 30, 2025

SEAN F. MCAVOY, CLERK

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

TAREK ABDUSSAMAD,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
KRISTI NOEM, PAM BONDI,
ANDREW DAVIDSON, DANIELLE
LEHMAN,

Defendants.

No. 2:25-CV-00045-MKD

ORDER DISMISSING ACTION

ECF No. 7

Defendants filed a Motion to Dismiss on April 25, 2025. ECF No. 7.

Plaintiff's response to the motion was due by May 16, 2025. *See* LCivR 7(c)(2)(B)(ii). The Court issued an Order to Show Cause directing Plaintiff to address why Defendants' motion should not be granted and this matter should not be dismissed consistent with LCivR 7(e). ECF No. 8. Plaintiff's response to the Order to Show Cause was due by June 16, 2025. Plaintiff has not filed a response.

In the Ninth Circuit, a district court may grant a motion to dismiss as unopposed pursuant to a local rule that permits the granting of a motion for failure

1 to respond. *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995). LCivR 7(e)
2 provides that the “failure to comply with the requirements” of LCivR 7(c) “may be
3 deemed consent to the entry of an order adverse to the party who violates” it.
4 Plaintiff has failed to comply with LCivR 7(c) and has failed to respond to the
5 Court’s Order to Show Cause. It appears Plaintiff has abandoned this case.

6 Having weighed “(1) the public’s interest in expeditious resolution of
7 litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the
8 defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases of their merits; and
9 (5) the availability of less drastic sanctions,” *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d at 53
10 (citation and quotation omitted), the Court grants Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss,
11 ECF No. 7, and dismisses this action, consistent with LCivR 7(e).

12 Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

13 1. Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss, **ECF No. 7**, is **GRANTED**.

14 2. Plaintiff’s Complaint, **ECF No. 1**, is **DISMISSED without prejudice**.

15 **IT IS SO ORDERED.** The District Court Executive is directed to enter this
16 Order, **enter judgment**, provide copies to the parties, and **CLOSE** the file.

17 DATED June 30, 2025.

18 s/Mary K. Dimke
19 MARY K. DIMKE
20 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE